

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/736,581

Q78469

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Figures 1A, 1B, and 1C with the attached, replacement Figures.

Attachment: 1 Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Formalities

With this Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 9 and 10. Therefore, Claims 1-9 and 11-14 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 12-14 have been withdrawn. Therefore, claims 1-9 and 11 are all the claims currently under consideration in the current Application.

In the current Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges Applicant's claim of foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Drawings

The drawings stand objected to. The Examiner indicates that Figures 1A-1C should be labeled "Prior Art." With this Amendment, Applicants amend Figures 1A-1C as shown, and respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Specification

The specification stands objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

Regarding the step of removing the protective layer, and the first pressure being higher than a second pressure, Applicants amend the specification as shown. No new matter is added.

Regarding the limitation of the electroconductive film and the electroconductive substance being different materials, Applicants note that page 5, lines 15-19 describe that "A metal such as Al, Au, Pt, Ti, Ag, Cu, Bi, Sn, Ni, Cr, Zn and the like alloys of these metals can be selected for use as the electroconductive thin film 12." Additionally, page 7, lns. 3-5 describe that "if the printing method is used, then an electroconductive paste such as Cu paste, Ag paste,

carbon paste, Au-Su paste, and the like can be used as the electroconductive substance to be inserted into the micropore.” Therefore, Applicants submit that it is clear from the specification that the film can be one of a number of metals and alloys and that the paste can be one of a number of metals, and thus, the film and the past can be different materials.

Therefore, in view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the specification be reconsidered and withdrawn.

§112, Second Paragraph

Regarding claim 7, the Examiner notes that “it is not understood how the second pressure on the side of the film facing the protective member is lower than the first pressure.” Applicants amend Claim 7, as shown to correct this error.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, the Examiner notes that the limitations recited therein are repetitive of limitations recited in claim 1, from which claims 9 and 10 depend. Applicants cancel claims 9 and 10.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejections of Claims 7, 9, and 10 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Regarding claim 11, Applicants note that the Examiner has provided no explanation regarding the §112 rejection of this claim. Additionally, in view of the above discussion of the support in the specification for the electroconductive film and the electroconductive substance being different materials, there appear to be no §112 issues with this claim.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the §112 rejection of Claim 11 be withdrawn or that the Examiner provide a clear explanation of any §112 rejection of Claim 11 in a new, non-final Office Action.

Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Sugihara, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0192939 (“Sugihara”). Claims 1, 6 and 8-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Takao, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0137701 (“Takao”). Claims 2-5, and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Takao.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-11 over Sugihara, Applicants submit that Sugihara fails to disclose or suggest “removing said protective member from the electroconductive film on the first surface of said substrate in an area corresponding to the micropore,” as recited in Claim 1. Applicants note that the Examiner has referred to Figures 5A-5G of Sugihara and asserted that the removal, using the resist pattern, of certain portions of the Au, Ni, and Cu layers in order to form the pads anticipates the limitation of removing the protective member. Applicants submit that the Sugihara removal of certain portions of the Au, Ni and Cu layers fails to anticipate removing a protecting member in an area corresponding to a micropore, as recited.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Sugihara fails to anticipate Claim 1 and further submit that Claims 4, 6, and 8-11 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependence on Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, and 8-11 over Sugihara be reconsidered and withdrawn.

As a preliminary matter, regarding Takao, Applicants submit that the publication date of the Takao reference (July 15, 2004) is after the United States filing date of the present Application (December 16, 2003) and that the United States filing date of the Takao reference (October 14, 2003) is after the priority date (December 20, 2002) of the present Application. Therefore, Takao is not a proper prior art reference against the present Application.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-11 over Takao, in the August 22 Response, Applicants argued that Takao fails to disclose or suggest removing a protective member, as claimed. In response to this argument, the Examiner currently asserts that the removal would have been obvious in view of Sugihara. However, Applicants note that the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 8-11 under §102 (not an obviousness rejection) and has rejected claims 2-7 under §103, but only over the Takao reference, not over Takao in view of Sugihara.

Therefore, Applicants submit that Takao fails to remedy the deficiencies of Sugihara and that Claims 1-11 are patentable over Takao for at least those reasons submitted above with respect to Sugihara. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-11 over Takao be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No. 10/736,581

Q78469

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Laura Moskowitz
Registration No. 55,470

Date: December 14, 2005